



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

equity pleading, there were bill, answer and replication, although the latter was the merest form; a defendant in equity might demur, plead or answer, and yet all three functions were performed by answer alone; most of the codes of procedure provided for complaint, answer and reply. And so on indefinitely. This might appear a very strong case. And yet it cannot be that regard for the number three as a symbol has had anything to do with the matter or that those who drew our codes and practice acts had ever heard of such a thing.

Yet, conceding, as one must, that such speculations as Professor Goudy's may lead us too far, one must concede also that he has called attention to a point of capital importance in connection with many distinctions and classifications upon which juristic ingenuity has thus far made no impression commensurate with the time and ability brought to bear upon them. No one who has to do with the classifications of the Roman jurists in the future can afford to overlook the element of number symbolism.

R. P.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. By David K. Watson. Chicago: Callaghan & Co. 1910. In two volumes. pp. xxxiii, ix, 1959.

This work deals with the Constitution in a way that will be appreciated by any one interested either in the origin of the instrument or in the mode by which the courts have applied it to the various emergencies arising since it was framed. The historical introduction begins with the meeting in 1774 of the First Continental Congress and ends with the assembling of the Federal Constitutional Convention in 1787, giving in eighty-eight pages an account of the forces leading to a more perfect union, and also a description of the members of the Federal Constitutional Convention. Then follows the main part of the work. The plan adopted is to deal with constitutional questions in the order in which the topics arise in the Constitution itself, and to deal with each question in an historical fashion, giving, among other things, such light as is thrown upon each topic by the Articles of Confederation, the proceedings of the Federal Constitutional Convention and of the several state conventions, contemporaneous letters, later letters and speeches, and the decisions of the courts. Throughout there is ample quotation from the Journal of the Federal Constitutional Convention, Elliot's Debates, judicial opinions, and other sources. The result is a piece of work which does not duplicate any of the other treatises, but which in a useful manner supplements each of them. The time has gone by when all that is to be said as to the Constitution can be embodied in only two volumes. Consequently the plan of this work necessarily excludes an attempt to cite all the decisions and also an attempt to present in the author's own words an idealized theory of the several topics. The author is well within his rights in thus limiting his plan; for citations can be gathered easily enough from digests and the like, and discussions can be found in many specialized treatises. After setting his limits, the author has worked within those limits with obvious diligence and with as much accuracy as can be expected in a presentation of so much material. The inevitable slips appear to be unimportant. On page 38 there is clearly something wrong with the chronology. On page 785 it is erroneously said that in *Dartmouth College v. Woodward* "The plaintiff was successful in all the courts of New Hampshire." On page 791 it is said that in *Ogden v. Saunders* bills of exchange had been endorsed to Ogden, whereas in truth they had been drawn on him and had been accepted. Such minute and immaterial errors cannot cause any fair-minded reader to question the author's accuracy. Indeed it has already been said that the author's diligence is obvious. The result is a work worthy to be placed beside the other general treatises on this vast and increasingly important subject.